• 2		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	an/	09/944,317	PARAGIOS ET AL.
	iui y	Examiner	Art Unit
		Christopher L. Lavin	2624
All Participants: Status of Application: <u>Allowed</u>			
(1) <u>Christopher L. Lavin</u> .		(3)	
(2) Donald B. Paschburg (reg. No. 33,753).		(4)	
Date of Interview: 9 August 2006		Time:	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:			
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed:  N/A			
Claims discussed: 1-16			
Prior art documents discussed: <i>Kamijo</i>			
Part II.			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet			
Part III.			
<ul> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.</li> </ul>			
(Examiner/SPE Signature)	(Applicant/	Applicant's Representative S	gnature – if appropriate)

Application No. 09/944,317

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted the applicant's representative as the examiner felt that after the last amendment the applicant was very close to allowable material. The examiner believed that based on specification page 9 there had been a slight mistake in the drafting of the claims. In particular there was a call for a background reference frame, where the spec called for a background reference model. By making this change and clearly stating that the model consisted of a plurality of states the applicant overcame all of the prior art. The applicant agreed to these changes, which can be seen in the examiner's amendment.